

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-57. The Examiner is thanked for performing a thorough search. Claim 21 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Although one of the claims (Claim 21) was amended, it would be improper for the next Office Action to be a final Office Action since the amendment would not cause the examiner to perform a new search.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 21-34

In paragraph 7, the Office Action rejected Claims 21-34 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 21 has been amended to recite structure "a storage medium..." Claims 22-34 depend on Claim 21. Therefore, Applicants believe that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 have been overcome.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-10, 12-16, 18-21, 24-25, 27-28, 30-31, 34-35, 37-48 and 50-57

In paragraph 8, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-10, 12-16, 18-21, 24-25, 27-28, 30-31, 34-35, 37-48 and 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,916 by Sedlar et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Sedlar"). Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Sedlar.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sedler does not teach or suggest, among other things "(b) distributing control through selection of inherited parameters of said hierarchical structure to at least one of said plurality of users...(z) providing a link...that is stored, wherein said link is available for access ...(d) prioritizing said at least a portion of said communications within said hierarchical structure ...(f) enabling dynamic interaction through further contributions of communications...in response to presentation of said selected portion... at least one discussion thread

comprising a recorded communication under said at least one of a plurality of topics that is conducted between participating users of said plurality of users,” as recited by Claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that Sedler teaches “(b) distributing control through selection of inherited parameters of said hierarchical structure to at least one of said plurality of users...” at Col. 35 lines 44-66 and Col. 11 lines 21-62. It appears that the Office Action is asserting that Sedler teaches inherited parameters at Col. 35 lines 44-66 and distributing control at Col. 11 lines 21-62. However, note that Sedler does not teach distributing control to at least one of his plurality of users where the control is distributed through selection of Sedler’s inherited parameters of Sedler’s hierarchical structure.

The Office Action asserts that Sedler’s “linking a file to a particular directory” teaches Claim 1’s “(z) ... a link” at Col. 27 line 27 to Col. 28 line 20. Sedler teaches the action of “linking a file to a particular directory” at Col. 27 line 49. However, Sedler does not teach “(z) providing a link...that is stored, wherein said link is available for access...” The Office Action also asserts that Sedler teaches “a link” at Col. 30 lines 22-24, which states, “Frequently, files within a project will contain references (e.g., HTML links) to other files within the same project.” However, Sedler goes on to say at Col. 30 lines 26-29, “Consequently, if a document is moved from one location in the directory hierarchy to another, or the name of the document is changed, then all references to that document are rendered invalid.” Thus Sedler teaches away from “a link” as recited by Claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that Sedler’s “multiple copies of a document” (Col. 27 line 11- Col. 28 line 20) teach Claim 1’s communications recited in Claim 1’s feature (a). Then the Office Action asserts that Sedler asserts that teaches “(d) prioritizing said at least a portion of said communications within said hierarchical structure” at Col. 36 lines 15-31. However, Sedler discusses a priority property of emails at Col. 36 lines 15-31 not prioritizing his multiple copies of a document.

The Office Action asserts that Sedler teaches “(f) enabling dynamic interaction through further contributions of communications...in response to presentation of said selected portion... at least one discussion thread comprising a recorded communication under said at least one of a plurality of topics that is conducted between participating users of said plurality of users,” (emphasis added) as recited by Claim 1 at Col. 27 line 11 to Col. 28 line 20 and Col. 28 lines 60-65. Instead of teaching “(f) enabling dynamic interaction through further contributions of communications...in response to presentation of said selected portion...” (emphasis added) Sedler teaches at Col. 27 line 38-41, “...the act of placing a technical document into the ‘ready for review’ directory could trigger the generation of a message to the user to notify the user that a new technical document is ready for review” (emphasis added) Further, although Col. 28 lines 60-65 state that large assignments may involve many people working together for extended periods of times in what are known as “projects,” Col. 28 lines 60-65 does not teach “at least one discussion thread comprising a recorded communication under said at least one of a plurality of topics that is conducted between participating users of said plurality of users.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Sedler does not teach or suggest, among other things “(a) receiving in an application in an application platform a communication...a link to a resource associated with said communication...(b)...information stored in a database...(c) ...interaction control parameters... ,” as recited by Claim 35.

The Office Action appears to assert that independent Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons that Claim 1 is rejected. The Office Action appears to assert that Sedler teaches “a link” recited in “(a)...a link to a resource associated with said communication,” (emphasis added) as recited by Claim 35 at Col. 30 lines 22-24 which states, “Frequently, files within a project will contain references (e.g., HTML links) to other files within the same project” and that Sedler’s multiple copies of documents teach Claim 35’s received communication. However, in this case Sedler would need to teach an initial input that comprises one of his copies of a document

and one of his HTML links from one file to another. However, Sedler does not teach such a feature. Nor would it make sense for Sedler to teach such a feature. Further note that Sedler goes on to say at Col. 30 lines 26-29, "Consequently, if a document is moved from one location in the directory hierarchy to another, or the name of the document is changed, then all references to that document are rendered invalid." Thus Sedler teaches away from "a link" as recited by Claim 35.

The Office Action appears to assert that Sedler's "multiple copies of a document" (Col. 27 line 11- Col. 28 line 20) teach the received communication recited in feature (a) of Claim 35. If this is the case, then what in Sedler teaches "(b)...information stored in a database" recited by Claim 35?

The Office Action appears to assert at the top of page 14 that independent Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons that Claim 1 is rejected. Note that the Office Action fails to point out a portion of any reference that teaches Claim 35's "(c)...interaction control parameters."

Since Sedler teaches away from "a link" as recited by the independent claims, Sedler cannot be combined with other references in future Office Actions to render embodiments recited by the independent claims obvious.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 1 should be patentable. For similar reasons, Claim 21 should be patentable. For at least these reasons Claim 35 should be patentable. For similar reasons, independent Claim 48 should be patentable. Claims 2-20 depend on Claim 1. Claims 22-34 depend on Claim 21. Claims 36-47 depend on Claim 35. Claims 49-57 depend on Claim 48. These dependent claims include all of the features of their respective independent claims. Further, these dependent claims include additional features which further make them patentable. Therefore, these dependent claims should be patentable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims should be patentable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-57 overcome the rejections of record. For reasons discussed herein, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1-57 be considered by the Examiner. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-57 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 7/30/, 2007



John P. Wagner Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Address:

Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, California 95076 USA

Telephone:

(408) 377-0500 Voice
(408) 234-3649 Direct/Cell
(831) 722-2350 Facsimile